2091

Liberty

NOT THE DAUGHTER BUT THE MOTHER OF ORDER — PROUDHON

Vol. XI.—No. 11. NEW YORK, N. Y., OCTOBER 5, 1895. Whole No. 323.

"For always in thine eyes, O Liberty!
Shines that high light whereby the world is saved;
And though thou slay us, we will trust in thee."
JOHN HAY.

On Picket Duty.

Owing to the recent collapse of a "modern" iron-framed building, there has been a revival of the agitation for licensing architects, and even certain semi-individualistic newspapers assert that the employment of incompetent men by builders conclusively establishes the argument for such licensing. But how about the government inspectors whose business it is to prevent faulty construction? How is their quality to be improved? If government officials do not show any greater honesty than architects, on what ground is it assumed that a license will insure stricter regard for safety?

Fortune continues to favor the German Socialists. Because they have protested against the anti-French *fêtes*, a number of their editors have been imprisoned, and another systematic crusade against the Social Democracy is to be started. The absurd emperor calls upon his troops to "resist the treasonable band, and wage a war that will free Germany from such elements." Special laws may again be demanded from the reichstag to suppress the Socialists. All this will but tend to strengthen their movement, however. It is to be hoped that the general liberal movement will also receive some benefit from this reactionary crusade against a free press and free speech.

To escape the tyranny of the country legislators it is proposed by some Democrats that the greater New York should be cut off from the rural wastes and made a State by itself. The "Tribune" denounces this as secession, and says that "your dyed-in-the-wool Democrat of today is nothing less than an Anarchist in disguise." No, the dyed-in-the-wool Democrat is an Anarchist without disguise. Unfortunately there are few genuine democrats in the Democracy, and the government is in no immediate danger. The average Democrat of today is not only no Anarchist, but he is not even a decentralizationist. He is as stupid as the "Tribune," and does not understand the difference between individual secession and the breaking up of greater States into smaller.

The champions of hard money and the gold basis generally meet the complaints of reformers in regard to the scarcity of currency by pointing to the great accumulations of gold in the banks. At first sight this appears a most telling argument, and even such authorities as the London "Economist" employ it with an air of complete triumph. What! they say; not enough gold when the banks have more of the metal than they can find room for? But, as a matter of fact, the fallacy in the argument is almost childish. Here is what the "Saturday Review" says on this point: "Bimetallists argue, and argue rightly enough, it seems to us, that this accumulation of gold testifies to the fact that there is an ever-increasing scarcity of gold, strange as the proposition may seem to the thoughtless. They say that the scarcity of gold is shown in an appreciation of the value of gold or a depreciation in the price of commodities. Every man, therefore, who embarks in business has to sell on a falling market. Consequently, men restrict enterprise as much as possible, and gold accumulates in banks because there is no profitable employment for it." The very evidence of depression is sought to be converted by the monopoly advocates into proof of abundance and prosperity.

The Prohibitionists are now divided into single-issue men and multiple-issue men. The latter triumphed at the recent State convention at Saratoga, and secured the adoption of a platform having a number of planks—all governmental, of course—in addition to prohibition. Those who go into politics as a party and seek to obtain control of the government, correctly argued one of the delegates, must have definite ideas regarding every subject with which government has to deal, and the people have a right to know what to expect of them. It is probable that the single-issue men may bolt and set up a separate organization. The Prohibitionists, it is evident, are losing ground, and are willing to "fuse" and take up new issues in order to escape political annihilation. Although they claim to have been making "mighty advances," the facts adduced in support of this claim all indicate the advance of the cause of temperance rather than prohibition. The fact that trade unions, benevolent and social orders, and financial corporations decline to extend membership or employment to men with drinking habits, instead of being encouraging to Prohibitionists, is an obstacle in their path. The advance of temperance is fatal to prohibition, and the attempt to confound the two is futile.

The chief issue in the coming campaign in this State is Sunday liquor, and the attitude of the two great parties toward it is decidedly characteristic. The Republicans met in convention and adopted a two-line plank declaring in favor of maintaining the "Sunday laws" in the interest of labor and morality. This was naturally construed to mean that the present anti-Sunday excise law would not be modified in a liberal direction, and the rural population manifested great delight in it. In all large cities, however, the majority of Republican editors and politicians have either sought, by transparently sophistical quibbling, to put upon the plank a different construction, more in consonance with "side-doors" and Sunday liquor, or else have openly repudiated it and declared in favor of local option in the matter of Sunday saloons. The Democrats met next, and adopted an excise plank which means all things to all men. It favors local option and home rule in excise ostensibly, but it is so worded that those who are bitterly opposed to these measures have no cause for kicking. The local option favored is such as the State legislature might deem reasonable, and, if the legislature does not deem any local option reasonable, then the platform clearly authorizes it to grant none. As both parties are after votes, and as neither knows which way the wind blows, they had to dodge the question in some way. The Democratic dodge is the cleverer of the two.

Manifestly, Nordau is not at all deceived as to the intellectual acumen of his journalistic disciples. With an eye strictly to commercial advantage, Nordau has had his "Conventional Lies of Our Civilization" republished and put upon the market. The success of his "Degeneracy" with the Philistines, he wisely reasoned, would insure an eager demand for another book of his. That the "Lies" contain teaching diametrically opposed to the burden of his "Degeneracy"; that the earlier work is, in fact, a typically "degenerate" production, full of heresies and shocking radicalism,—did not trouble the smart Max in the least. He knew that, having proved himself a stanch conservative and pillar of sanity by his "Degeneracy," neither the ordinary reader or the ordinary critic would perceive or expose the inconsistencies between that book and the "Lies." The event has completely justified his speculation. No critic has detected the trick, and the "Lies" are received as a perfectly natural thing from the author of "Degeneracy." A few writers, it seems, have found Max out, and are denouncing him as an ignorant pretender and charlatan. It is a pleasure to state that Shaw's review of "Degeneracy" in Liberty has had considerable influence on the course of criticism and has done much to reduce Nordau to his proper level. Shaw has rendered a great service to a number of American editors, as anyone reading their editorials on Shaw vs. Nordau can plainly see "between the lines."

Liberty.

Issued Fortnightly at Two Dollars a Year; Single Copies, Eight Cents.

BENJ. R. TUCKER, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

Office of Publication, 24 Gold Street.
Post Office Address: LIBERTY, P. O. Box No. 1312, New York, N. Y.

Entered at New York as Second-Class Mail Matter.

NEW YORK, N. Y., OCTOBER 5, 1895.

"In abolishing rent and interest, the last vestiges of old-time slavery, the Revolution abolishes at one stroke the sword of the executioner, the seal of the magistrate, the club of the policeman, the gauge of the exciseman, the erasing-knife of the department clerk, all those insignia of Politics, which young Liberty grinds beneath her heel." — PROUDHON.

☞ The appearance in the editorial column of articles over other signatures than the editor's initial indicates that the editor approves their central purpose and general tenor, though he does not hold himself responsible for every phrase or word. But the appearance in other parts of the paper of articles by the same or other writers by no means indicates that he disapproves them in any respect, such disposition of them being governed largely by motives of convenience.

Some "Facts" for Mr. Bliss.

In my comments on Mr. Bliss's letter regarding the success of "municipal Socialism" in Great Britain, I ventured to express the belief that the facts, if closely examined by critical eyes, would tell a different tale from that we hear from partial and prejudiced witnesses. Curiously enough, I did not have to wait long for strong confirmation of this belief. It comes, too, from a source which will command the respect of Mr. Bliss. The "Tribune's" English correspondent (Mr. Smalley's successor) has been writing an interesting series of letters on the "municipal Socialism" of Glasgow, Birmingham, Leeds, Bradford, Manchester, and other cities, and his tone is extremely friendly to the experiment. He has endeavored to point out every advantage afforded by "municipalization," and he has referred to the arguments of the opposition only for the sake of exposing their alleged unsoundness. Editorially, in commenting upon these letters, the "Tribune" has warmly endorsed its correspondent's attitude, and argued that the name "Socialism" ought not to blind rational men to the beauties of the "illustrations of municipal Socialism." Now, it is in one of these pro-municipalization letters that I find the following statements under the sub-heading of "increased tax rates":

> Taxpayers in these Yorkshire towns have felt the burdens of municipal progress. Huddersfield's rates have been nearly doubled. Bradford pays over six shillings to the pound, which is a very large increase over the rates of twenty years ago. Leeds has a debt of $20,000,000, and taxation is higher than it was. These towns have not done so well as Glasgow and Birmingham in the management of town finances. Many land-owners and householders who feel the pinch when they pay their taxes are inclined to shake their heads ominously, and to declare that the town councils have gone too far in many directions and paid altogether too much attention to "faddists,"—which is probably the most overused of the new words in the English vocabulary. Much criticism of the same general tenor is expended upon the county and parish councils, which have recently been reorganized on a more democratic basis; and the opinion is frequently expressed that public discontent with the work of these local councils was one of the main causes of the recent political revolution. . . . Progressive local government, such as is now known in these Yorkshire towns, is expensive. *Great municipal debts have been created*, and the interest charges and sinking funds have to be carried. Water supplies cannot be enlarged, nor gas works purchased, nor extensive drainage works carried out, nor street railways constructed and equipped, nor large portions of the populous districts municipalized and rebuilt, *without additional cost to the taxpayer*. But, when the municipal finances of these towns are analyzed, the fact is disclosed that the local debts have been rolled up mainly in the construction of public works which were practically indispensable. What are known as "fads"—such as wash houses, technical schools, municipal lodging-houses, and model tenement-houses—are responsible for a very small propo tion of the local indebtedness. The great sources of municipal debt have been the water and gas supply, the drainage works, the construction of tramways, and corporation improvement schemes. Most of these undertakings are already remunerative, and all were imperatively needed. The remarkable reduction of the mortality wherever the overcrowded districts have been transformed into corporation streets leaves nothing to be said against the practical wisdom of the statesman-like municipal policy introduced in Glasgow and Birmingham.

Certainly there are some eye-opening "facts" here for Mr. Bliss, who has so confidently asserted that the municipalities in question have not had to raise the tax rate one farthing. In view of this direct issue of fact between Mr. Bliss and the "Tribune" correspondent, it is proper to ask Mr. Bliss to refer us to some authoritative source for corroboration of his statements. *A priori*, there can be no question that Mr. Bliss must be mistaken, and that the "Tribune" correspondent knows whereof he writes. And, if Mr. Bliss *has* mistaken dreams and wishes for facts, what becomes of the case which he sought to establish by means of his "facts"? If, as the "Tribune" correspondent plumply says, "municipal progress" cannot be secured "without additional cost to the taxpayer," then it is clear that (as Mr. Bliss freely admitted) "voluntary Socialism through the State" is impossible.

Apart from the bearing of the unexpected "Tribune" revelations on Mr. Bliss's air-castles, it is interesting to note that even the claim of the correspondent that "most of these undertakings are already remunerative" is vigorously denied in some responsible quarters. Manifestly "municipal Socialism" is by no means as simple a phenomenon as Mr. Bliss and his co-believers fancy. Read this little paragraph from the "Evening Post":

> The Glasgow experiment in the municipalization of street railways has been watched with great interest, and its complete financial success confidently announced. From the working accounts submitted for the eleven months ending May 31, 1895, such an announcement would appear to be justified. The tramway committee of the corporation of Glasgow report that they are able to turn over to "the common good" profits amounting to $41,000. But along came an expert accountant a month ago, who had had exceptional experience in analyzing tramway accounts, and showed, in the London "Times," that the apparent profit was really a deficit. From the very figures published by the corporation he asserted, and appeared to prove, that there had been "a net loss of not less than $100,000." The trouble was the old one of not writing off enough for working expenses or depreciation. Thus the actual loss on live-stock was $10,000 more than allowed for in the accounts, working expenses of $65,000 were not charged at all against the revenue, etc. The Glasgow men have not thus far made any reply to this damaging analysis, though one would seem to be urgently demanded.

It appears, then (if this "Times" expert is correct), that not only must the taxpayers supply, by increased taxation, the funds needed to start "illustrations of municipal Socialism," but that they must continue to submit to increased taxation in order to meet the annual deficits caused by municipal management. Compare this situation with Mr. Bliss's utopia as outlined in the last issue of Liberty, and ponder on the incalculable value of "facts," so impressively urged on us by our friend.

V. Y.

The Voting Passion.

I have heard, with considerable surprise, that a valued friend of Liberty and intelligent individualist has resolved to vote the ticket of the Socialist Labor party this fall in pursuance of a rather peculiar negative policy. While he has no sympathy whatever with State Socialist doctrines and would vigorously oppose any practical effort to impose upon us any part of the constructive State Socialist programme, he is of the opinion that, at present, when the State Socialists are in the minority and utterly powerless for mischief, it is perfectly safe to support them politically. And the reason he desires to support them is that, in his judgment, such a course would best answer his immediate purpose, which is to enter an emphatic protest against the *existing* social system. In politics, in other words, the Socialist Labor party, he holds, is most prominently identified with the revolt against present arrangements, and hence every uncompromising enemy of injustice and wrong can best express his dissent by fighting under its flag.

This is a curious, incomprehensible attitude attitude for an enlightened, well-informed, and level-headed individualist, and it is worth while to subject it to some examination.

Our friend, then, in the first place, is at war with the present system, and he is anxious to aid in destroying it. If he had no ideal of a better system, and sought to destroy in the mere belief that *something* more satisfactory would necessarily emerge, it would, perhaps, be consistent for him to make common cause with the party which promised most speedy destruction. The Socialist Labor party would not, however, answer to this description, for it does not content itself with destroying, but builds, and lays special stress on its constructive work. No one who aids it can separate its negative from its positive task. To coöperate with it implies either real sympathy with its building operations, or, at least, such indifference to them as proceeds from a vague belief that, while they might be unwise, there is also some probability of their being fairly successful. A man might say to himself: these people are destroying something which I want to see removed and building something which may or may not be better than the old; let me help them to destroy, and run the risk involved in the constructive work. But our friend occupies a different position. He *has* an ideal, and holds that the State Socialist substitute is not an improvement on the present system, not a step in the right direction. He would not consciously help them to build something which he would have to pull down in order to be able to carry out his own ideas of what the new structure should be. Were there the least probability of State Socialist success, he would

never think of putting *his* shoulder to the wheel. He is willing to coöperate with them, provided their work remains without positive results.

This is certainly an amazingly inconsistent attitude. The assumption underlying it is that there is no way of protesting against existing conditions except through voting with the State Socialists. But this is clearly, flagrantly erroneous. Politically, there may be no party so radically opposed to our industrial system as the State Socialist party; but why is it necessary to protest through the political method? Must we all deposit a ballot—Australian or other—in order to record our dissatisfaction? What does the ballot do? Is it intended to influence others, or merely to carry out the behest of one's own conscience? Surely either, or both, of these purposes can be subserved by other means than the ballot. There is the pen, and there is the tongue. There is the boycott of the ballot-box and current politics, which, by the way, may be accompanied by the other two. In short, there are many ways of recording one's protest outside of party politics, and it is incumbent on our friend to show that voting the State Socialist ticket is the best and most efficacious method of antagonizing the present order.

There are people in this world to whom activity is of more importance than the object of the activity, who forget that means are employed only for the sake of the end, and who cannot understand that passivity, waiting, may be as essential as active campaigning. For example, there are people who feel that they must vote simply because other people do so. The fact that the others vote because they expect to get something (or believe that they expect) is lost sight of, and they vote even when they despair of getting anything. Our friend is not one of this class. Then why must he vote? Why cannot he leave party politics altogether, if his side is not represented by any of the warring factions, and adopt other means of impressing his fellows?

After all, it is impossible to rid one's self of the suspicion that the man who is ready to lend his support to a party at any time and for any purpose must feel a vague sympathy in the innermost recesses of his soul for the principles of that party. He may be largely unconscious of it, and may try to excuse himself by plausible explanations, but the germ of active sympathy with the party attracting him is present. If this suspicion is not wholly without foundation, our friend is an embryonic State Socialist.

V. Y.

A Superficial Suggestion.

As may be seen from his letter in another column, Mr. Henry Seymour, who strayed for a time from the path of reason on the standard-of-value question, but afterwards returned to it, thinks that he has discovered a solvent in which the differences between the standard and no-standard adherents will ultimately disappear. He tells us that, if we just say standard value instead of value standard, the breach will be closed forever. I fear that Mr. Seymour does not yet clearly appreciate the extent of this breach. If the use of the phrase value standard is, as Mr. Seymour says, an error more verbal than real, and if this verbal error is all that separates the two theories, then it cannot be true, as Mr. Seymour claims, that one theory is fundamentally wrong and the other fundamentally right. But it is not true that the difference between the two theories is merely verbal; it is real and vital. The no-standard advocates are no more strenuous in their contention that there is and can be no standard of value than in their contention that the selection of a definite quantity of a commodity as a monetary unit is the central error of prevailing monetary systems and naturally prohibitive of the mutualistic idea in finance. It is the *thing*, not the name only, that they combat. Consequently Mr. Seymour's proposal to change the name and retain the thing will not satisfy them for a moment.

Nevertheless I am not at all hostile to Mr. Seymour's suggestion. Although to my mind the two phrases, value standard and standard value, denote precisely the same thing, it is possible that the latter connotes more forcibly than the former the idea that the standard, whatever it may be, is man-selected rather than God-appointed. To lay emphasis on this idea can do nothing but good. But it will not open the eyes of the opponents of a standard. In fact, their argument might be stated in the form of a proposition that, God having appointed no standard, man cannot appoint one. Of course the argument is a false one. In nature there is no invariable standard of length; yet man has appointed one, and thereby has greatly enhanced his powers. It varies, but it serves. And, if Mr. Seymour will note that there is as much reason for calling the yard the standard length instead of the length standard as for calling the dollar the standard value instead of the value standard, perhaps he will realize that he places undue importance upon his present proposal.

T.

What is Property?

Having disposed of the arguments of Mr. Lloyd and Mr. Matter against property in children prior to their mental development into social beings, I now come to those of Mr. Badcock, whose letter appeared in the last issue of Liberty. The difference between Mr. Badcock and myself seems to hinge on the determination of the prime motive that prompts defensive association. He thinks that the motive is sympathy,—that we associate primarily to defend others, not to defend ourselves. He thinks that, when A and B combine for protective purposes, A is moved to this course chiefly because he wishes B to be secure in his liberty and property, and that B is moved by a similar prime interest in A, or, it may be, that both A and B are moved to make their combination because each is primarily interested in securing the liberty of an outsider, C. This is all that I can gather from the opening paragraph of Mr. Badcock's letter, and especially from the sentence in which he declares that without the stimuli of the sympathetic feelings no plans would be pushed.

Such a declaration clearly involves the idea that the desire for one's own liberty is insufficient to prompt one to associate with others to secure it by agreeing to secure theirs in return. It greatly puzzles me to find such doctrine propounded by an Egoist. If I were convinced of its truth, I should at once abandon my claim that children should be property. But in the same breath I should abandon many other things as well. Once show me that mere sympathy is sufficient to make interference justifiable and expedient, and I shall undertake to govern my fellow-men in many thousands of ways. The difficulty will be to find a sufficient number of persons whose sympathies are identical with mine to enable an exercise of controlling power. If sympathy is to determine our course in these matters, there is no reason why those who believe that total abstinence from liquor-drinking is conducive to the happiness of the abstainer should not enforce abstinence upon all, or why those who believe that unequal distribution of wealth is a cause of suffering should not resort to collective ownership of the means of production in order to level fortunes, or why those who believe that godless teaching is inimical to human welfare should not suppress all propagandism save that which emanates from the Vatican; and similarly, of course, there is no reason why those whose sympathies so move them should not combine to protect children from cruel parents. In fact, I do not dispute for a moment that any persons who choose to make the attempt may ignore well-founded political teaching, and act, either individually or in association, for the attainment of any purpose whatsoever. The only question for such people to consider is whether such action can result successfully and is expedient. To determine this they will find it necessary to take into account the facts and conditions confronting them and the motives that govern mankind in general.

And here, taking direct issue with Mr. Badcock, I assert that sympathy is not the prime motive of defensive association, and that the one motive common to all persons who enter into such association is the protection of self. It seems to me that this fact is very clearly recognized by Mr. Badcock in his "Slaves to Duty." "In defending others against aggressors," he says in that pamphlet, "we lessen the chances of being attacked ourselves. In pursuing such *egoistic* conduct our sympathetic natures are developed." What does this mean, if not that we primarily defend others in order to make ourselves secure, and that sympathy is later and secondary,—in fact, largely a direct outgrowth of the associative action which the desire for *self*-protection originally inspires? Self-protection being, then, the motive of the association, it is of the highest importance to suit the association to the attainment of that end. Now, how will this matter be viewed by mankind in general? We can best answer this question by assuming the non-existence of all political institutions and the confrontation of human beings such as they are today with the problem of association for defence. In the absence of such association each individual is a lego, at liberty to consider the entire universe, including even adult humanity, as his own so far as he has power to make it so. Now, inasmuch as the proposed defensive association, in order to the attainment of this end, must be as inclusive as possible, so that there will be no temptation for persons capable of joining it to remain outside and thereby constitute an obstacle to the association's object; and inasmuch as it is parti-

cularly desirable to include those who, from lack of sympathy in their natures, would be especially dangerous and disturbing as outsiders,—it becomes necessary to inquire what the least sympathetic individual will insist on as a condition of joining the association. Clearly this individual will reason as follows:

"At present the entire universe is subject to my appropriation, so far as my might permits. There are, however, other beings on earth of whom the same is true. With these obviously I shall clash. It will be to my advantage to reduce the appropriable portion of the universe, if I can thereby hold securely and with less clashing such portion of the remainder as I may succeed in appropriating. I am willing, then, to enter into an agreement with others whereby each of us shall undertake: (1) to refrain from attempts to appropriate certain portions of the universe; (2) to join in preventing these portions of the universe from being appropriated by anybody; and (3) to join in protecting the property of those who may appropriate any other portion of the universe. What portions of the universe shall we exempt from appropriation? It is for my interest and for the interest of those contracting with me to surrender as little as possible of the appropriable sphere, and yet it is equally essential to surrender so much of it that the possibility of interference with appropriation of the remainder may be reduced to a minimum. The forces which can thus interfere and whose liability to interfere can be lessened by admission to participation in the agreement are those, *and only those*, which are capable of understanding and entering into the agreement. It is for my interest, then, that all such forces, and no others, should be excluded from the appropriable sphere. These forces comprise only human beings, and only such human beings as have reached a stage of mental development which enables them to promise not to invade as a condition of not being invaded. My agreement, therefore, shall be with these mentally-developed human beings, and the right to appropriate these in the measure of my might I voluntarily relinquish, reserving my right to appropriate any other being or anything that exists and is not already appropriated."

In this line of reasoning we find the necessary conditions of defensive association arrived at in obedience to the single motive that is common to all the contracting parties; and it is clear that these conditions place undeveloped children in the property sphere. That out of this mutualism in protection there grows an interest in the welfare of others, developing the sympathetic nature in the human breast, I not only do not deny, but assert as joyfully as Mr. Badcock. I look upon this development, too, as a finer and more delightful thing than the soil in which it has its root. But upon this soil it is dependent none the less. And the logic of this growth is not that "the sympathies extend the liberties," as Mr. Badcock claims, but that the liberties extend the sympathies. If you make sympathy the soil, tyranny will be the ugly growth. But, if you make the desire for self-liberty the soil, the beautiful flower of sympathy will ultimately bloom. From the lower to the higher,—that is the order of nature. There is a sense, indeed, and a very important sense, in which the sympathies, after their development, do extend the liberties. They extend the liberties voluntarily allowed by the owners to the beings that they own, and thereby both animals and children greatly profit; they do not extend, however, but rather are born of, those liberties which it is the function of defensive association to enforce. It is true also that the sympathies may and do become, in a steadily increasing number of individuals, an additional and secondary motive for participation in the contract, but they are never basic; and, while it is conceivable that they should become so strong and universal that even the least sympathetic individual would then be willing to exclude children from the property sphere, this condition would in itself imply a cessation of cruelty to children and render the prohibition thereof superfluous. In other words, this again would be a voluntary granting, by owners, of a degree of liberty to the beings owned. This same development of sympathies might lead in the same manner to the exclusion of masterpieces of art from the property sphere. Knowing the inestimable happiness that a *chef-d'œuvre* can give the human race, and knowing the virtual impossibility of its reproduction, and knowing its liability to abuse or destruction by an unappreciative owner, we should, if we obeyed our sympathetic instincts, take it from such an owner. But to reduce the property sphere in this and similar ways would tend to cause the unsympathetic and ill-disposed persons whom it is the prime purpose of the defensive contract to bring to terms, to decline to come to terms,—that is, to decline to join in the contract. Therefore, since a defensive association that will be attractive to such persons is of the first necessity for all of us, it would be in the last degree inexpedient to exclude works of art from the property sphere before the motive for such exclusion had disappeared through the decline of the disposition to abuse works of art. All of which means that the work of sympathy properly belongs in the voluntary realm. The force realm exists, not to meet the sympathies, but to protect the primary interests of those who constitute it.

It seems to me unnecessary to deal with Mr. Badcock's subsidiary considerations. In the first place, his letter was written before he had seen my later articles on this subject, in which I have already met points similar to those which he raises. In the second place, the argument employed above meets squarely his central contention. If it is sound, it is conclusive, and renders the discussion of other points needless. If it is unsound, it is for Mr. Badcock to point out the fallacy.

I wish to disclaim, however, any share in the belief which Mr. Badcock supposes me to hold in common with him that parents are the natural guardians of their offspring. I do not see why he supposes me to believe this, for not only is guardianship, as he says, not synonymous with ownership, but it is flatly contradictory of it so far as the guardian is concerned. Guardianship implies responsibility to another. In ownership there is no such responsibility. As I maintain that a mother is the owner of her child, of course I deny that she is the guardian of her child. And in this connection I may notice an argument which Mr. Badcock is alone in bringing forward. To distinguish children from property, he says that parents are not producers of their children in the same sense that they are the producers of their handiwork, because the evolution of the child's complex tissues and endowments goes on independently of the parents' will. If this proves anything, it proves too much and abolishes property altogether, for there is no production whatsoever which is not aided by and absolutely dependent upon the qualities inherent in matter, which the producer did not create. How much, pray, has a farmer's will to do with the evolution of the tissues and endowments of a potato? If it is "grotesquely impudent" for a mother to claim that she produced her child, it is equally so for the farmer to claim that he is the producer of his crop of hay. It is an old charge of the Communists that all believers in private property are "grotesque in their impudence." Does Mr. Badcock agree with them?

And similarly does Communism show its head in the doctrine of Mr. Phipson, stated in his letter in another column, that the rights of sentient beings are determined by their capacities. The capacity of a sentient being to eat may establish its right to get food if it can, but it does not establish its right to be provided with food by others, or the duty of others to feed it. To declare otherwise is to adopt the Communistic principle, "To each according to his needs." If Mr. Phipson is not an Egoist, his only means of converting me to his view of children's rights is to show me that the Egoistic philosophy is a false one. If he is an Egoist, then he cannot claim that children or adults have any rights except such as they may acquire by contract or such as may be granted them by other contracting parties. It remains then to consider whether it is consistent with the primary purpose of the defensive contract to grant rights to undeveloped children. I have advanced arguments to show that it is not. Until these arguments have been refuted, I have no occasion to review Mr. Phipson's letter. But I take this occasion to congratulate him on being, I believe, the first among my critics to recognize the fact that there are other dangers than that of cruelty to children which must be weighed in this discussion.

T.

Comrade Lloyd as Critic.

I join Mr. Lloyd in congratulating our English friends on their contributions to the literature of Anarchism, but I do not join him in all his criticisms upon them. What he says of Mr. Seymour's "Two Anarchisms" (which is modeled after Lesigne's "Two Socialisms") is perfectly sound both in its praise and its censure. But there is no foundation whatever for the exceptions which he takes to the motto adopted by Mr. Gilmour from Macaulay for his "Creed of Liberty," or to Mr. Badcock's contention that "duty to self" is an absurdity.

In considering the Macaulay motto some attention must be paid to the obvious meaning of the author. No man in his senses could be guilty of claiming that men will discard slavery for liberty before enough of them have grown sufficiently wise to understand the superiority of liberty to make it impossible for others to sustain slavery. Yet that is the meaning

which Mr. Lloyd attributes to Macaulay. That author's statement, on the contrary, is clearly to be interpreted as if it were worded as follows: "If men are to wait for liberty till they become *perfectly* good and wise in slavery, they may indeed wait forever." Macaulay undoubtedly intended the reader to understand the adjectives good and wise as descriptive of those qualities in their entirety or perfection, and the idea that he desired to rebuke was that pernicious doctrine which Mr. Lloyd is always doing his best to countenance,—the doctrine that we shall have Anarchy when the millennium comes, and not before. Macaulay believed that liberty is a condition that furthers the development of goodness and wisdom,—a means as well as an end. Mr. Lloyd, on the contrary, often writes as if it were only an end.

True, he sometimes, as in his criticism on Mr. Seymour, writes exactly the other way. But then, consistency in thought is the last thing to be expected from Mr. Lloyd. Of all the prominent writers developed by the Anarchist movement Mr. Lloyd, though in some ways one of the best, is surely the most inconsistent, the most unreliable intellectually. He remains the poet even when writing prose. He sees the truth in flashes of exceeding brilliancy, and the next moment becomes again a dweller in the outer darkness. He seldom writes an article without undoing at the end all that he did at the beginning.

His interpretation of Mr. Badcock is as unwarranted—I could almost say as perverse—as his interpretation of Macaulay. When one expects to be criticised by Mr. Lloyd, he must never employ a style that is in the least elliptical, for that gentleman has no eye for that which is hidden between the lines. If Mr. Badcock had stated his view without any ellipsis, the sentence quoted by Mr. Lloyd would read as follows: "The call of duty is an internal compelling force which overcomes the individual's disinclination to take that course which *seems to him* likely to prove, *in the long run*, the *least agreeable* or the *most disagreeable*." When the position is put thus fully, Mr. Lloyd's criticism upon it loses all its point. The man who is far-seeing enough to "take nauseous medicine to recover health" does not, in taking the dose, overcome his repugnance to the disagreeable. Such overcoming, in his case, could be accomplished only by refusing to take the dose and thereby bringing upon himself what he foresaw as the most disagreeable consequences. One who so takes medicine does not do it in obedience to the internal compelling force to which Mr. Badcock refers, and therefore does not act from a sense of duty. That philosophy which takes the name of Egoism while insisting on duty to self differs in no important sense from Moralism itself. T.

The "Conservator" brings me what it calls the "important and significant" information that Mr. Kitson's book on money has received the indorsement of Robert Blatchford, the author of "Merrie England." Let Edward Bellamy now give it the stamp of his approval, and Kitson's discomfiture will be complete. If Anarchism shall succeed in unloading this book upon the State Socialists, it will indeed have cause to congratulate itself. But I do not understand Traubel's adjectives. Even were Blatchford the most competent man living in questions of finance, what would his opinions be to Traubel? I thought that he rejected all authorities, and that with him expert testimony settled nothing. Why, then, does he call Blatchford's views on value "important and significant"?

"It would be rash to say with Herbert Spencer," writes the great philosopher of the New York "Press," that "the propitiation of the spirits of ancestors is the first germ of all religions." Conservative and fit for Spencer, but rash for the "Press"! Here you see the difference between a reckless, ill-informed, irresponsible scribe like Spencer and a cautious, learned, and deliberate scientist like the "Press" writer. Can you hesitate between them? And, if Spencer is so rash in religion, how can you follow him in sociology? What a pity the "Press"—one cent a day only—is not more widely appreciated! Its profound teachings on finance, trade, international law, and ethics are all but wasted. A few genuine Americans are alone privileged to sit at its feet.

The invasive tyranny practised in boarding-schools by the boys themselves, which Mr. Phipson cites in his letter in the present issue as the strongest argument against Anarchism within his knowledge, is not an argument against Anarchism at all. It is an argument against the doctrine of non-resistance. The proneness of some people to confound these two things is hard to understand. Anarchism does not assume that all people will voluntarily refrain from invasion, but undertakes to discipline by force those who persist in invasion.

The Standard-of-Value Controversy.

To the Editor of Liberty:

The recent interesting discussion in Liberty anent the standard of value has had the effect of stimulating me, for one, to examine more closely, and from an independent and impartial standpoint, the problem involved. Even those of us who are habituated to free thought on all matters are apt occasionally to run in a groove. We are, of course, unconscious of such an intellectual vice, until we are rudely awakened thereto by the appearance of some obstinate fact that positively refuses to harmonize with some preconception or other. But to the point.

In judging between the two theories propounded,—the one by Mr. Kitson, the other by Mr. Bilgram and yourself,—I am bound to say that my faith has not been shaken in the slightest degree with respect to the latter theory. But I have clearly perceived one important thing, the full recognition of which must eventually harmonize the two divergent schools. It is this,—that, while Mr. Kitson (who echoes Macleod) is fundamentally wrong, and the commodity-standard advocates are fundamentally right, the latter, by mere routine, have been guilty of an error in terminology, the consequences of which have been more far-reaching than at once appears. It is true, as Macleod, Westrup, Kitson, and others have declared, that a standard of value is an impossibility by the very nature of things; for the presumption contained in the phrase "standard of value" is that there is some absolute and invariable criterion, which may be referred to as evidence of what value consists in.

Now, the already constituted value—the commodity adopted of which a definite quantity is the monetary unit—is quite another thing. Such is, properly speaking, a *standard value* (it being the one selected to which all others may be compared by which they may be expressed); but it is in no sense a standard *of* value, if words have any definite meaning at all.

While, as I have said, the error committed by the commodity-standard advocates is more verbal than real, I am nevertheless convinced that the misconception resulting therefrom has led their opponents to speak in one and the same sense of a standard of value and the monetary denominator, from which confusion of ideas has resulted the conclusion that, the former being impossible, the latter is equally so.

HENRY SEYMOUR.

51 ARUNDEL SQUARE, LONDON, AUGUST 10, 1895.

Kitson Made Into Hash.

[Henry Seymour in London Weekly Times and Echo.]

I have followed Mr. Morrison Davidson's latest utterances on political and economic subjects with profound interest, and have rejoiced that they have revealed so much close reasoning and power of analysis such as is unfortunately too seldom met with in your average labor "leader," who, lacking in scientific data, generally relies upon mere sentimental clap-trap to supply its place.

It was with pleasure that I read his endorsement of Mr. Arthur Kitson's view, in his recently-published book on the money question, that the idea that the land question is the fundamental or bottom question for the workers is a great superstition; that the money question is of infinitely more importance. This is especially encouraging to me, inasmuch as I have been pegging away at this idea for some time; and, while I have never yet been seriously met with any logical objection, the idea has apparently made little headway. A great deal hangs upon this issue, I am convinced, and land reformers will have to consider it sooner or later.

While, however, I have so much to approve in Mr. Davidson's writings, I am reluctantly compelled to point out that he has unwittingly suffered himself to be influenced by the absurd and sophistical conclusions arrived at by Mr. Kitson in regard to the question of value and its denominator. Before Mr. Kitson published his book, I warned him of these economic heresies (which had obviously been borrowed from Macleod, Jevons, and others), and predicted that his book would meet with a great deal of hostile criticism from competent sources. No heed, however, was paid to that. But no sooner did the book appear than the battle began to rage, and in the New York Liberty there has been, for some months, a perfect fusillade of adverse criticism, and discussion of the points raised, in which Mr. Kitson himself has taken part. The result is exactly as I anticipated, and there can be no two opinions about it. Mr. Kitson's position has been literally cut into mince-meat. I ought in justice to add that, apart from these two errors, the book is otherwise generally sound. But these errors vitally affect the scientific solution of the money question.

Every inch of the ground covered by Mr. Kitson has been gone over in the columns of Liberty, with the result that the two ridiculous propositions paraded by Macleod and Jevons—(1) that value is merely a relation (they here unwittingly confounding value with price), and (2) that a commodity standard or monetary unit is both impossible and unnecessary—have no longer any economic significance, and are as dead as a door-nail.

What is to be kept clearly in mind is that the idea of either money or credit is unthinkable apart from a commodity unit, and that there is not the slightest evil in gold being adopted as a standard value, or mere value denominator (which fact renders all consideration of bi-metallism superfluous), but that all the trouble arises from the forced necessity to liquidate debts in specie,—that is, in the identical commodity which has been adopted to merely express in common language the respective value of things. It is that and nothing else which gives the gold cornerers all their power to enslave and exploit labor, to monopolize land, and to control the means of production.

As Mr. Davidson truly says: "The solution of the money question is to be found in free exchange." It is also equally true that the solution of the labor question is to be found, and alone found, in the solution of the money question. And now that Socialism, with all its prospective tyranny, officialism, and paternalism, is beginning to be discredited amongst English workmen, it is opportune to push the free currency propaganda, which, unlike Socialism, promises economic equality without the necessity to surrender personal liberty.

The Government Fakir.

I'm elected, I'm elected, and I'm feeling gay and
grand;
How the shysters gather round me, how they grasp me
by the hand!
No more for votes I'm trading; the battle's fought and
won;
I am now a legal fakir, and I'm bound for Washington.

Of course it was expensive, the running the campaign
With beer and bands of music; (but I'd everything to
gain);
The people so love jingo and the politician's bray
That they voted for me often, and we've nobly won
the day.

Now I'm going to save the country; I'll advance our
glorious cause;
With a tariff for the whiskey trust, more sumptuary
laws;
The sugar trust protection can always get from me,
And the plutocrats (for money) shall have my
sympathy.

For the railroad kings and combines I will do my level
best;
I'll give them whatsoe'er they want; the devil take the
rest.
I purchased my election, and freely paid the cost;
But, when I retire from office, I shall have nothing
lost.

The workingmen (poor fools!) expect to find a friend
in me,
And how I love them (for their votes) they very soon
will see.
When they become unruly and refuse to drudge and
slave,
I'll order out the soger-boys and force them to behave.

When I retire from office, then I'll travel for my
health;
No questions ever will be asked about my sudden
wealth;
With the parasites and flunkeys I then will take my
stand,
And the fakir will be honored as the saviour of the
land.

Anna K.

From "Menschliches, Allzumenschliches."

[Translated from the German of Friedrich Nietzsche by George Schumm.]

THE WORTH OF WORK.—In order to *justly* determine the worth of a piece of work, we should have to be able to consider most closely how much time, industry, good or bad will, compulsion, ingenuity or laziness, honesty or sham was put into it,—that is, we should have to be able to place the whole personality of the workman, according to his intellectual, moral, and other worth, into the balance,—which is impossible. Therefore it must be said also here: "Judge not!" But it is precisely the cry after "justice" which we hear from those who are dissatisfied with the appraisal of work. If we think further, we shall find that every personality is irresponsible for its product, its work; a *reward* is consequently not to be derived from it; each piece of work is as good or bad as it must be in a given necessary constellation of forces and weaknesses, knowledge and desires. It does not rest with the pleasure of the workman *whether* he works; or *how* he works, either. Only the narrower and broader aspects of *utility* have created the valuation of work. That which we now call justice is in *this* field very well in its place: as a highly refined utility which not only takes cognizance of the moment and exploits the opportunity, but contemplates the stability of all conditions, and therefore considers also the welfare of the workman, his physical and mental contentment, *in order* that he and his descendants may work well also for our descendants and constitute a trust even beyond the term of an individual human life. The *exploitation* of the workman was, as we are now beginning to understand, a piece of stupidity, a robbery at the expense of the future, an imperilment of society. Now we already have, as a consequence, almost war; and certainly the cost of maintaining peace, of making treatises, and regaining confidence will now be very great, because the folly of the exploiters has been very great and protracted.

THE RIGHT OF UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE.—The people did not give themselves universal suffrage; they received and provisionally accepted it wherever it is now in force; but they certainly have the right to relinquish it, if it does not meet their expectations. This appears now everywhere to be the case; for, if, on any occasion where it is exercised, hardly two-thirds, yea, perhaps not even the majority, of those who are entitled to vote go to the polls, this is a vote *against* the whole electoral system itself. We must reason still more closely here. A law which gives to the majority the final decision in matters pertaining to the welfare of all cannot be built on the same foundation which it itself creates; it necessarily requires a still broader one, and this is the *unanimous consent of all.* Universal suffrage must not only be the expression of a majority will; the whole country must demand it. Therefore the opposition of a very small minority is already sufficient to abandon it again as inexpedient: and the *non-participation* in an election is just such an opposition, invalidating the entire electoral system. The "absolute veto" of the individual, or, not to speak narrowly, the veto of a few thousands, is suspended over this system as the logic of justice; in every exercise which is made of it, it must first prove by the manner of the participation in it that it *is still in force by right.*

EXCHANGE AND EQUITY.—An exchange would be honest and equitable only if each of the two parties to it demanded so much as his commodity seems to be worth to him,—the trouble of acquiring it, its rarity, the time spent on it, etc., being taken into consideration, beside its affectional value. As soon as one of the parties fixes his price *with regard to the need of the other,* he becomes a finer robber and extortioner. If money is one of the objects of exchange, there remains to consider that a dollar is an entirely different thing in the hands of a wealthy heir, a day-laborer, a merchant, a student; each, according as he did almost nothing or much to acquire it, may receive little or much for it,—that would be equitable; in truth, the reverse is the case. In the great world of finance the dollar of the laziest millionaire is more profitable than that of the poor and the industrious.

Anarchism and the Trade Union.

To the Editor of Liberty:

Comrade Cohen's statement that trade unions are the most thoroughly Anarchistic organizations to be found in our present society is one that, as an Anarchist, I cannot allow to pass unchallenged. I am afraid that Cohen's zeal for the cause that is "noble and holy" has blinded his judgment, and that, if he is not checked, he will become a soft-brained sentimentalist rather than a plumb-line Anarchist as he claims to be. My personal knowledge of Cohen precludes the suspicion of his being a demagogue; otherwise certain expressions in his communication to you would bias me to that opinion. Regarding the particular boycott on the "Arena" I have nothing to say, except to hint to Cohen that the facts of the case are necessarily unknown to him, and to declare my opinion that the whole action is a stupid, mean, and undignified one for a union to take. But on the general case of boycott, when he says, "you must not think that I would take this position regarding a paper that could not afford to pay, and was really struggling," I inquire why must we not think so? Is he not aware that straight unionism makes no distinction? For ten years or more, as a union man, I have endeavored to establish this principle of distinction, and have endeavored to show the fallacy of what is called a uniform scale of prices, always being defeated on the principle, but sometimes getting support as an expediency measure. Does Cohen boycott or oppose only rich concerns? In boycotting does he use his individual judgment? Or, in refusing to boycott,—which is the same thing,—does he set his judgment against the order of the union? Does he not boycott anything which the Federation orders, as well as those without a union label? Does *not* having a label prove that a concern is prosperous and could pay higher wages, and does having a label prove that the concern does not exploit its laborers as much as those without one? Would Cohen, as a union man, dare to flaunt a coat, hat, shoes, etc., without a union label, even though he had proof that higher wages were paid to the laborer on the unlabelled goods? Could he justify his action in smoking a K. of L. cigar by showing that that particular firm paid as high or higher wages? By his own testimony he should support the "Arena," if it could be shown to him that the magazine is a struggling, poverty-struck organ, hardly able to exist; and I can assure him that it is only business bluff on the part of the publisher to blow about its success, it being my private opinion that Flower's "obstinacy" is due rather to the fact that the printer of that magazine is Flower's creditor than to the fact that Flower himself is an exploiter. Prove this as I may, yet Cohen dare not support that organ, even though its pages were filled with plumb-line Anarchy.

This talk about paying highest prices is childish; worse, it is stupid. Certain shrewd bosses use a label to send off inferior goods and play on the gullibility and loyalty of innocent people to exploit them all the more. Besides, what prevents Cohen, as an individual, from buying cheap goods? And, label or no label, if he knows the price paid doesn't justify fair wages, what prevents him from forwarding the extra money to the employees direct? Don't say this can't be done, until you are willing to do it. Express your willingness, and I will show you plenty of methods. Why not hire women direct to make collars, cuffs, ties, etc., and men direct to make your shoes, etc.? Because it costs too much? Do you mean to say that in buying necessaries of life you pay less attention to quality and worth and more attention to labels and boycotts? Quality and other things equal, will you pay more for the article with a label on it than for the article without a label? Don't beg the question, and say labeled articles are best. That has to be proven; and, if they are the best, where is your sacrifice? You ought to be ready to pay higher price for the worst. I would like a direct answer to this, because in it is involved the whole economic fallacy of trade unionism.

Comrade Cohen's adhesion to unionism as an "ism" will soon lead him into unconscious pharisaism. His sympathies are not with all laborers as a class against capitalists. In this sense K. of L.-ism is far superior to trade unionism from a humanitarian point of view, and their leaders are as "noble and holy," although they were defeated at the last Federation convention. "My ism is orthodoxy, your ism is heterodoxy," is too narrow for a broad-minded humanitarian like Cohen. (This is a long subject; else, I'd like to show that the demagogues in trade unions are either pharisaical cannibals or blatant idiots in fighting the K. of L. But, if it is necessary for Cohen's salvation, I may continue it in another article.) But Cohen as unionist treats the Knight of Labor as an enemy. At the last convention of the Federation he did valiant duty; I heard his praises sung by Boston delegates; and thereby hangs many a tale.

This brings me back to the claim that trade unions are thoroughly Anarchistic. As I heard Daniel Lynch say in Boston: "Of all the wire-workers and hypnotizers they ever got together in a Federation, that Denver crowd beats all; they beat poor Gompers at his own game!" And they must have hypnotized Cohen.

I maintain that a trade union is a despotic, tyrannical, arbitrary, and ignorant body; that its individual members are as selfish, overbearing, and intolerant of opposition as any other organization to be found in our present society; and that a trade union is no more worthy of respect than any other monopoly,—like Sugar trust or Pullman trust,—*except that its members are the under dogs* in a cannibalistic fight. A trade union has no more sense of equity or justice or liberty than any other organization, political, religious, or social. I do not say it is worse; it is sufficient to say that it is no better than any other organization; such pretentious claims as Cohen makes need proof.

As an economic factor a trade union is next to worthless. If the ideal of the Federation could be realized and every wage-worker enrolled as one of its members, the condition of the laborer as a class would scarcely be changed.

And yet I am a trade unionist, but not a pharisee or

a demagogue. My reasons are a personal matter, and not a public issue.

If Comrade Cohen wants to discuss these propositions as they are stated, let him begin. If he cares to change the wording of the propositions, let him suggest modifications; and then let us stick close to the point. Yours truly, A. H. SIMPSON.

The Rights of Children.

To the Editor of Liberty:

Although, I hope, as thorough going an Anarchist as anybody, I was certainly startled by your proposition that children have no more rights than chattels or animals. The fact, however, that you lump these two together, although there is manifestly considerable distinction between an inanimate chattel and a sentient creature, would indicate that there may be yet further distinction between an animal and a human child, just as there are gradations in the status of the child as it becomes more and more competent to understand and make a contract.

While, however, a child progresses in intelligence and the capacity for mental suffering, it remains all its life, like an animal, equally sensitive to physical pain, and this, it seems to me, is what gives it an absolutely equal right with any grown-up person to happiness. And, as happiness is the sole end of any ethical system whatever, to deny it to children, or even animals, is to stultify the whole science and reduce every effort towards progress to absurdity.

Indeed, it is difficult to believe that you use the word "rights" here in the ordinary sense, but that your real meaning is, while admitting the abstract right of children to happiness, that it is impossible to enforce it without a still greater infringement of liberty than that which might result if parents were left free to treat their children as they pleased. No doubt there is much force in this contention, but it must be remembered that it is public opinion, far more than laws or even Anarchist "juries," which regulate people's conduct, and to let it be admitted that children might be punished, tortured, or killed at their parents' option would simply, in innumerable cases, lead to such outrages being perpetrated; just as in France, where it is the custom, animals are much more cruelly used than in England, where there is general sentiment and law against such ill usage. Mrs. Mona Caird's theory, as set forth in "Personal Rights," seems to be the soundest,—*viz.*, that the rights of all sentient beings are determined by their capacities; the obvious deduction from which is that, while babies, who can feel pain but do not feel death, may be painlessly destroyed, and older children who have no purpose in life, but dread the knowledge that death is coming, may only be killed if that is done instantaneously and without warning, so no child who has begun to understand the value of life may be deprived of it without his consent, nor one who is capable of mental suffering be compelled to endure it, and no child at all physically assaulted except according to the same rules as apply to adults.

And, speaking of mental torture, I have a word to say respecting the controversy between yourself and Mrs. Dietrick. Here again the main postulate to be borne in mind is that no one has a right to cause unprovoked pain to another, and, if not physical pain, *à fortiori* still less mental pain, seeing that this is the worse to bear of the two. And there are greater outrages of this nature than even to be called a fool or a thief, and where one is still more defenceless. If, for instance, a man chooses to wear long hair, or sandals instead of boots, this surely is no affair of any other person, and yet in a drawing room he would be grinned at, in the street hooted and perhaps mobbed, nor would he get any peace until he gave up his "fad," no matter how rational and even beneficial to any who adopted it, and dressed like every one else. Let a lady go along any of our lower class streets on a bicycle, especially if dressed in knicker costume, and what kind of treatment will she receive? Yet she has no redress, and, if she ventures to expostulate, the mildest answer she is likely to get will be: "Pooh! there is no law against laughing." No, there is not, and no public sentiment against it either, and consequently we all are held in abject terror, and compelled, whether we like it or not, to do, within narrow limits, the same as everybody else does.

The only chance for the weak is in combination, and just as Anarchists, by sticking together and invoking the aid of other persecuted bodies, can manage to obtain some amount of consideration, so children must look to those whose sympathies are with them to resist the tyranny and cruelty of parents, and compel them to grant the same rights to happiness as they themselves enjoy. EVACUSTES A. PHIPSON.

P. S.—One of the strongest arguments I know against Anarchism, because based on experience instead of theoretical, is the horrible tyranny and bullying that goes on in large boarding-schools. These are practically Anarchistic, since "sneaking" to the master is as much tabooed by schoolboy ethics as is hitting a combatant when he is floored, and any boy resorting to such a means of protection would be ostracized. Yet, so far from such equal liberty leading to the concession of equal rights for the weak or even a sentiment of fairness, we find a most elaborate and autocratic system of aggression in force, the younger boys being treated worse than slaves by the elder, while, instead of the weak majority banding together for protection, they invariably support and applaud the bullies, and even take pleasure in witnessing or assisting in the torture or abuse of their fellows. This proves at least that the unscrupulousness and cruelty of human nature is not entirely due to the struggle for a living, and that, even where ample bodily requirements are supplied without effort, and all are on an equality and without any privileged government, there is a constant striving after mastery and delight in inflicting pain on others. Also that the general sentiment is rather with the invader than the invaded, the most flagrant example of which is the respect shown for a murderer, while every one loathes the hangman who but gives him a dose of his own medicine.

Creeds and Summaries.

For a long while I have been trying to notice two or three good things which friends in England have sent me.

I used to wish that Anarchism could be boiled down, and, instead of being bound only in large books, or scattered piecemeal through libertarian papers, be condensed in such plain, simple language and cheap handy form that anybody might have it in a nutshell.

"The Two Anarchisms," by Henry Seymour, is an admirable attempt to meet this want. It is a very pretty leaflet, printed on tinted paper strong and fine. It is a sharp, clear-cut comparison between Communistic and Mutualistic Anarchism. In each definition communism is described first and mutualism second, and, this order being maintained throughout, it is very easily understood. The language is good and the tone dignified and fair.

Here follow a few quotations:

One believes that everybody would cheerfully labor under communistic institutions; the other has no faith in shirking being got rid of by conditions which render it easier.

One believes in an equality of *Comforts;* the other believes in an equality of *Rights*, which guarantees to each the opportunity to be equally comfortable.

One desires to expropriate everybody; the other desires to make the producers the proprietors.

One says: "The product to the community, and to each according to his needs"; the other says: "The product to the producer, and to each according to his deeds."

In brief, so generally admirable and brilliant is this leaflet that I am very sorry I cannot endorse it without criticism; but the last three definitions check my enthusiasm a little.

One would destroy marriage and the family; the other would consolidate them.

Just what is meant by "consolidate" here? At the best it looks doubtful, and at the worst it may mean that in free society every man is the husband of every woman, and every woman the wife of every man, and all adults responsible as parents, in the one great Consolidated Family.

Better explain, Mr. Seymour, or drop it.

In the next paragraph my objection is verbal. The defensive association is spoken of as a "*free* government." This was doubtless well meant, but, as Anarchists define government as *invasion*, the term, consistently translated as "free invasion," would look funny. Anarchists stand for no government, and, to avoid confusion, we had better let the terms "law" and "government" alone.

In the next and last definition we are told that Mutualists believe "that it is through stirpiculture alone that crime may be completely eradicated, and with it the necessity of the State."

Now, while any Anarchist may hold this faith, I doubt that very many do. And with most of those who favor stirpiculture the "alone" is too strong. Speaking for myself, I have no strong faith that crime ever will be "completely" eradicated. So far as it may be eradicated, many other things beside stirpiculture will conduce to that result; for example, education in enlightened egoism and natural rights; abolition of State government; sympathy; fear of the boycott and defensive associations; the absence of temptation, lack of opportunity, and mere habit and custom of being just as found in free society; all these and others will render stirpiculture not "alone" in the good work.

"The Creed of Liberty," by William Gilmour, is so good that I believe I have no word of fault-finding. Clear, definite, brief, and simple in language, it seems nearly a model. I shall recommend it everywhere. This man's enthusiasm and good sense bid fair to give him a leading place among our pioneers.

But I do not like the motto from Macaulay: "If men are to wait for liberty till they become good and wise in slavery, they may indeed wait forever."

On the contrary, I affirm that, until men become wise enough to understand liberty and good enough to establish and maintain it (and that means to be "wise and good" in a very true sense), they must remain slaves. External liberty without so much wisdom and goodness beneath it is a house built without foundations, sure to result in ruins. External liberty is indeed a good thing, but cannot be maintained for a moment except in so far as the spirit of liberty is in its supporters. Given internal liberty, and external liberty will be as inevitable as his shell fits the healthy oyster. Real Anarchism is an individual and public spirit of non-invasion. Anarchism, as an external form, with its egoism, its contract, its juries, boycott, and defensive associations, so-called, may be as complete and terrible an engine of invasion as any government, unless the spirit of human non-invasion is really, and not nominally, the spirit of those who maintain it. Names are nothing; the will is everything; for in the long run the purpose is sure to express itself. The intellect is its servant. Slavery is now upon us. If we, under this slavery, become wise enough to understand liberty and good enough to will it, we shall be free. Otherwise not. And that is the all of it.

"Slaves to Duty," by John Badcock, is a gracefully-written little booklet, with a great deal of real literary merit. A fine contribution to the literature of Egoism.

A better summary of the arguments against Duty in the special sense, the artificial duty of Church, State, and conventional morality, I know of nowhere; but, with all hearty acquiescence in the spirit and intention of his book, I think Mr. Badcock has made a mistake in fighting against "natural duty" and "duty to self" as justifiable terms.

He says: "The call of duty is an internal compelling force which overcomes the individual's disinclinations, to do something disagreeable or indifferent. The person feels under an obligation."

I accept that. It is excellent. A sense of obligation resulting in an internal compelling force, even in the overcoming of the resistance of the disagreeable, is something that occurs to every man on almost every day of his life, and, therefore, whatever the theory, duty, as thus defined, must be admitted to naturally exist and naturally enforce itself. The next time Mr. Badcock sees any one take a nauseous medicine to recover health, he will observe a perfect illustration of "natural duty," "egoistic duty," or "duty to self." If he will analyze the situation, he will find the "obligation," the "internal compelling force," the "overcoming of the disagreeable," the sense of relief, "like the payment of a just debt," all there. This kind of duty exists in nature, and always will exist, whether we affirm or deny it or give it other names.

"Duty to self," the last resting-place for the duty superstition, is a self-contradiction. *Duty* is unthinkable, except as an *obligation*. How can an indi-

vidual be under an obligation to himself? How can I owe myself something? Shall I transfer a shilling from one pocket to another to settle the debt? *Duty to self* is an account in which the same person is both debtor and creditor. Those who cannot see that such an account balances, that it is settled and cancelled by the very terms in which it is stated, require lessons in bookkeeping.

This is brilliant and satirical. It is almost convincing, at first blush. But unfortunately there is nothing to it. It is what we Americans call a "bluff," The simple fact that a man can feel "obliged," by "an internal compelling force," to do something whose end is his own benefit, but which at the same time is horribly disagreeable to him, very suddenly takes all the laughter and the glitter out of it and leaves duty to self established.

But of course the Christian and altruistic Duty, which hangs in the air without support, and calls on all men to worship it, "willy-nilly, whatever the consequences to themselves," is too absurd for reasonable men to do more than smile at, and those who bow to it are indeed "Slaves to Duty."

Speaking of these things reminds me that "Egoism," of California," has a new "Purpose and Principles" on its last page. I have read it with great pleasure, regard it as the best summary of egoistic principles yet printed, and, except the little inevitable clash where it declares that "the Egoist . . . recognizes no duty to anything nor anybody by anybody," I endorse it altogether. J. WM. LLOYD.

Anarchist Letter-Writing Corps.

The Secretary wants every reader of Liberty to send in his name for enrolment. Those who do so thereby pledge themselves to write, when possible, a letter every fortnight, on Anarchism or kindred subjects, to the "target" assigned in Liberty for that fortnight, and to notify the secretary promptly in case of any failure to write to a target (which it is hoped will not often occur), or in case of temporary or permanent withdrawal from the work of the Corps. All, whether members or not, are asked to lose no opportunity of informing the secretary of suitable targets. Address, STEPHEN T. BYINGTON, Flushing Institute, Flushing, N. Y.

Target for entire Corps.—Henry Cohen, 1239 Welton St., Denver, Col. Send him shots reviewing the pamphlet "Mutual Banking," by Wm. B. Greene, which, having been for a time out of print, is now to be republished in Denver about November 1. Cohen is going to push the sale, and wants a lot of reviews to send to labor and Populist papers. If you haven't read Col. Greene's work, refer to it as having just been republished (the publication will be past by the time your letter reaches the paper that prints it); speak of it as strong, valuable, timely, etc.; give some account of the essential points of the system proposed, and indicate the advantages of that system. Then, if you don't tell your readers that you have never read it, they won't know your review from one that a professional reviewer might write without seeing the book.

STEPHEN T. BYINGTON.

FRANCIS NOREEN

A PRACTICAL TAILOR CATERING TO THE FASTIDIOVS AND ECCENTRIC AT FORTY-ONE ESSEX STREET BOSTON, MASSACHVSETTS

RIPANS TABULES regulate the stomach, liver and bowels, purify the blood, are safe and effectual. The best general family medicine known for Biliousness, Constipation, Dyspepsia, Foul Breath, Headache, Heartburn, Loss of Appetite, Mental Depression, Painful Digestion, Pimples, Sallow Complexion, Tired Feeling, and every symptom or disease resulting from impure blood, or a failure by the stomach, liver or intestines to perform their proper functions. Persons given to over eating are benefited by taking a TABULE after each meal. Price, of druggists or by mail, Box (6 Vials, 75c.) Package (4 boxes) $2.00. Address THE RIPANS CHEMICAL CO., New York. Samples free.

SLAVES TO DUTY.

By John Badcock, Jr.

A unique addition to the pamphlet literature of Anarchism, in that it assails the morality superstition as the foundation of the various schemes for the exploitation of mankind. Max Stirner himself does not expound the doctrine of Egoism in bolder fashion. 30 pages.

PRICE, 15 CENTS.

Mailed, post-paid, by
BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 1312, New York City.

MODERN MARRIAGE.

BY ÉMILE ZOLA.

Translated from the French by Benj. R. Tucker.

In this his latest story Zola takes four typical marriages,—one from the nobility, one from the *bourgeoisie*, one from the petty *bourgeoisie*, and one from the working-people,—and describes, with all the power of his wondrous art, how each originates, by what motive each is inspired, how each is consummated, and how each results.

PRICE, 15 CENTS.

Mailed, post-paid, by the Publisher,
BENJ. R. TUCKER, BOX 1312, NEW YORK CITY.

INSTEAD OF A BOOK:

BY A MAN TOO BUSY TO WRITE ONE.

A FRAGMENTARY EXPOSITION OF

PHILOSOPHICAL ANARCHISM.

Culled from the Writings of
BENJ. R. TUCKER,
EDITOR OF LIBERTY.

With a Full-Page Half-Tone Portrait of the Author.

A large, well-printed, and excessively cheap volume of 524 pages, consisting of articles selected from Liberty and classified under the following headings: (1) State Socialism and Anarchism: How Far They Agree, and Wherein They Differ; (2) The Individual, Society, and the State; (3) Money and Interest; (4) Land and Rent; (5) Socialism; (6) Communism; (7) Methods; (8) Miscellaneous. The whole elaborately indexed.

Price, Fifty Cents.

Mailed, post-paid, by the Publisher,
BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 1312, NEW YORK CITY.

THE BALLOT.

BY WILLIAM WALSTEIN GORDAK.

A short poem illustrating the absurdity of majority rule. Printed as a leaflet, with an effective advertisement of Liberty on the back. Excellent for propagandism.

Ten Cents Per Hundred Copies.

Mailed, post-paid, by
BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 1312, New York City.

LIBERTY'S LIBRARY.

For any of the following Works, address,
BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 1312, New York, N. Y.

THE QUINTESSENCE OF IBSENISM. By G. Bernard Shaw. Pronounced by the London *Saturday Review* a "most diverting book," and by the author "the most complete assertion of the validity of the human will as against all laws, institutions, *isms*, and the like, now procurable for a quarter." Ibsen's works have been read very widely in America, and there have been almost as many interpretations as readers. This conflict of opinion will cause the liveliest curiosity to know what view is taken by Mr. Bernard Shaw, who is not only one of the keenest students of Ibsen, but one of the wittiest writers in England. He takes up the plays *seriatim*, subjects each to searching analysis, and extracts the quintessence of the whole. Nearly 200 pages. Price, paper, 25 cents.

CAPTAIN ROLAND'S PURSE: How It is Filled and How Emptied. By John Ruskin. The first of a projected series of Labor Tracts. Supplied at 37 cents per hundred.

THE STORY OF AN AFRICAN FARM. By Olive Schreiner. A romance, not of adventure, but of the intellectual life and growth of young English and German people living among the Boers and Kaffirs; picturing the mental struggles through which they passed in their evolution from orthodoxy to rationalism; and representing advanced ideas on religious and social questions. A work of remarkable power, beauty, and originality. 375 pages. Price, cloth, 60 cents; paper, 25 cents.

HEROES OF THE REVOLUTION OF '71. A souvenir picture of the Paris Commune, presenting Fifty-One Portraits of the men whose names are most prominently connected with that great uprising of the people, and adorned with mottoes from Denton, Blanqui, Pyat, Proudhon, J. Wm. Lloyd, Tridon, and August Spies. Of all the Commune souvenirs that have ever been issued this picture stands easily first. It is executed by the phototype process from a very rare collection of photographs, measures 15 inches by 24, and is printed on heavy paper for framing. Over 50 portraits for 25 cents.

THE WIND AND THE WHIRLWIND. By Wilfred Scawen Blunt. A poem worthy of a place in every man's library, and especially interesting to all victims of British tyranny and misrule. A red-line edition, printed beautifully, in large type, on fine paper, and bound in parchment covers. Elegant and cheap. 32 pages. Price, 25 cents.

BOMBS: The Poetry and Philosophy of Anarchy. By William A. Whittick. 187 pages. Price, cloth, 75 cents; paper, 50 cents.

SO THE RAILWAY KINGS ITCH FOR AN EMPIRE, Do They? By a "Red-Hot Striker," of Scranton, Pa. A reply to an article by William M. Grosvenor in the *International Review*. Price, 10 cents; per hundred, $4.00.

LOVE, MARRIAGE, AND DIVORCE, and the Sovereignty of the Individual. A discussion between Henry James, Horace Greeley, and Stephen Pearl Andrews. Including the final replies of Mr. Andrews, rejected by the New York *Tribune*, and a subsequent discussion, occurring twenty years later, between Mr. James and Mr. Andrews. 121 pages. Price, 25 cents.

MY UNCLE BENJAMIN. A humorous, satirical, and philosophical novel. By Claude Tillier. Translated from the French by Benj. R. Tucker. With a sketch of the author's life and works by Ludwig Pfau. This work, though it has enjoyed the honor of three translations into German, has never before been translated into English. It is one of the most delightfully witty works ever written. Almost every sentence excites a laugh. It is thoroughly realistic, but not at all repulsive. Its satirical treatment of humanity's foibles and its jovial but profound philosophy have won its author the title of "the modern Rabelais." My Uncle Benjamin riddles with the shafts of his good-natured ridicule the shams of theology, law, medicine, commerce, war, marriage, and society generally. 312 pages. Price, cloth, $1.00; paper, 50 cents.

LIBERTY'S LIBRARY.

For any of the following Works, address,
BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 1312, New York, N. Y.

ANARCHISM: ITS AIMS AND METHODS. An address delivered at the first public meeting of the Boston Anarchists' Club, and adopted by that organization as its authorized exposition of its principles. With an appendix giving the Constitution of the Anarchists' Club and explanatory notes regarding it. By Victor Yarros. 30 pages. Price, 5 cents; 6 copies, 25 cents; 25 copies, $1.00; 100 copies, $3.00.

GOD AND THE STATE. "One of the most eloquent pleas for liberty ever written. Paine's 'Age of Reason' and 'Rights of Man' consolidated and improved. It stirs the pulse like a trumpet call." By Michael Bakounine. Translated from the French by Benj. R. Tucker. 52 pages. Price, 15 cents.

MUTUAL BANKING: Showing the radical deficiency of the existing circulating medium, and how interest on money can be abolished. By William B. Greene. Price, 25 cents.

FREE POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS: Their Nature, Essence, and Maintenance. An abridgment and rearrangement of Lysander Spooner's "Trial by Jury." Edited by Victor Yarros. 47 pages. Price, 25 cents.

WHAT IS PROPERTY? Or, an Inquiry into the Principle of Right and of Government. By P. J. Proudhon. Prefaced by a Sketch of Proudhon's Life and Works. Translated from the French by Benj. R. Tucker. A systematic, thorough, and radical discussion of the institution of property,—its basis, its history, its present status, and its destiny,—together with a detailed and startling *exposé* of the crimes which it commits, and the evils which it engenders. 500 pages octavo. Price, cloth, $2.00; paper, $1.20.

SYSTEM OF ECONOMICAL CONTRADICTIONS; Or, the Philosophy of Misery. By P. J. Proudhon. Translated from the French by Benj. R. Tucker. This work constitutes the fourth volume of the Complete Works, and is published in a style uniform with that of "What Is Property?" It discusses, in a style as novel as profound, the problems of Value, Division of Labor, Machinery, Competition, Monopoly, Taxation, and Providence, showing that economic progress is achieved by the appearance of a succession of economic forces, each of which counteracts the evils developed by its predecessor, and then, by developing evils of its own, necessitates its successor, the process to continue until a final force, corrective of the whole, shall establish a stable economic equilibrium. 469 pages octavo, in the highest style of the typographic art. Price, cloth, $2.00.

A POLITICIAN IN SIGHT OF HAVEN: Being a Protest Against Government of Man by Man. By Auberon Herbert. Price, 10 cents.

INVOLUNTARY IDLENESS. An exposition of the causes of the discrepancy existing between the supply of and the demand for labor and its products. By Hugo Bilgram. 119 pages. Price, cloth, 50 cents.

A LETTER TO GROVER CLEVELAND ON HIS False Inaugural Address, the Usurpations and Crimes of Lawmakers and Judges, and the Consequent Poverty, Ignorance, and Servitude of the People. 1886. By Lysander Spooner. 110 pages. Price, 35 cents.

THE ANARCHISTS: A Picture of Civilization at the Close of the Nineteenth Century. A poet's prose contribution to the literature of philosophic and egoistic Anarchism. The author traces his own mental development in London amid the exciting events of 1887,—the manifestations of the unemployed, the rioting at Trafalgar Square, and the executions at Chicago. The antagonism between Communism and Anarchism sharply brought out. By John Henry Mackay. Translated from the German by George Schumm. 315 pages, with portrait of the author. Price, cloth, $1.00; paper, 50 cents.

TAXATION OR FREE TRADE? A Criticism upon Henry George's "Protection or Free Trade?" By John F. Kelly. 16 pages. Price, 5 cents; 6 copies, 25 cents; 100 copies, $3.00.

SOCIALISTIC, COMMUNISTIC, MUTUALISTIC, and Financial Fragments. By W. B. Greene. Price, $1.25.

CO-OPERATION: ITS LAWS AND PRINCIPLES. An essay showing Liberty and Equity as the only conditions of true co-operation, and exposing the violations of these conditions by Rent, Interest, Profit, and Majority Rule. By C. T. Fowler. Containing a portrait of Herbert Spencer. Price, 6 cents; 2 copies, 10 cents.

PROHIBITION. An essay on the relation of government to temperance, showing that prohibition cannot prohibit, and would be unnecessary if it could. By C. T. Fowler. Price, 6 cents; 2 copies, 10 cents.

THE REORGANIZATION OF BUSINESS. An essay showing how the principles of co-operation may be realized in the Store, the Bank, and the Factory. By C. T. Fowler. Containing a portrait of Ralph Waldo Emerson. Price, 6 cents; 2 copies, 10 cents.

CORPORATIONS. An essay showing how the monopoly of railroads, telegraphs, etc., may be abolished without the intervention of the State. By C. T. Fowler. Containing a portrait of Wendell Phillips. Price, 6 cents; 2 copies, 10 cents.

CO-OPERATIVE HOMES. An essay showing how the kitchen may be abolished and the independence of woman secured by severing the State from the Home, thereby introducing the voluntary principle into the Family and all its relationships. By C. T. Fowler. Containing a portrait of Louise Michel. Price, 6 cents; 2 copies, 10 cents.

LAND TENURE. An essay showing the governmental basis of land monopoly, the futility of governmental remedies, and a natural and peaceful way of starving out the landlords. By C. T. Fowler. Containing a portrait of Robert Owen. Price, 6 cents; 2 copies, 10 cents.

THE UNCONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE LAWS of Congress Prohibiting Private Mails. 1844. By Lysander Spooner. 24 pages. Price, 10 cents.

NO TREASON.—No. II. 1867. By Lysander Spooner. 16 pages. Price, 15 cents.

NO TREASON.—No. VI. Showing that the constitution is of no authority. 1870. By Lysander Spooner. 59 pages. Price, 25 cents.

ILLEGALITY OF THE TRIAL OF JOHN W. WEBSTER. Containing the substance of the author's larger work, "Trial by Jury," now out of print. 1850. By Lysander Spooner. 16 pages. Price, 10 cents

NATURAL LAW: Or, the Science of Justice. A treatise on natural law, natural justice, natural rights, natural liberty, and natural society; showing that all legislation whatsoever is an absurdity, a usurpation, and a crime. Part First, 1882. By Lysander Spooner. 21 pages. Price, 10 cents.

A LETTER TO THOMAS F. BAYARD. Challenging his right—and that of all the other so-called senators and representatives in Congress—to exercise any legislative power whatever over the people of the United States. By Lysander Spooner. Price, 3 cents.